

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)**ScienceDirect**

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 90 (2013) 458 – 467

**Procedia**  
Social and Behavioral Sciences6<sup>th</sup> International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (InCULT 2012)

## The Role of Code-Switching as a Communicative Tool in an ESL Teacher Education Classroom

Nik Mastura Nik Ismail Azlan<sup>a</sup> and Suthagar Narasuman<sup>b\*</sup><sup>a</sup>Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia<sup>b</sup>Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, 40200, Selangor, Malaysia

---

### Abstract

This research sought to investigate how code-switching functions as a communicative tool in a English as a second language teacher education class in a tertiary institution in Malaysia. Surveys, observations, and interviews were carried out to elicit relevant data. Qualitative data was collected using an observational framework. The findings revealed that three types of code-switching known as tag switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching were predominant in classroom communication between students and between students and the instructor. The study was also able to ratify several systematic and predictive reasons for code-switching in the classroom. The study also found that English was the dominant language of communication while code switching was used to convey ideas in specific situations and to enhance solidarity in the first language.

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of the Faculty of Education, University Technology MARA, Malaysia.

*Keywords:* Types of Code-switching, Reasons for Code-switching, Code-switching as Communicative Tool, Language Dominance, Classroom Interaction;

---

### 1. Introduction

Code-switching is generally defined as the shifting that occurs “between two or more languages simultaneously or interchangeably within one conversation” (Grosjean, 1982, p. 145). Sert (2005) states that there are two opposing sides on the issue of code switching in language classroom settings. On one side, there are the teachers who prefer to adhere to the formal rules of second language learning which compels students to

---

\* Nik Mastura Nik Ismail Azlan. Tel.: +6-017-258-5502

E-mail address: [nikmastura@salam.uitm.edu.my](mailto:nikmastura@salam.uitm.edu.my)

speak only in the target language and practice communicative techniques in order to master the language well. This opinion is supported by Taha (2008) who found that some teachers and students involved in the study of code-switching in an Arabic university believed that “alternation between English and Arabic in the classroom” should be discouraged and that all members of the classroom were obligated to use the medium of instruction designated for the study (p. 337). However, language instructors who support bilingual instruction in the form of code-switching believe it to be extremely useful to students in many different aspects, especially in the teaching of beginner students (Sert, 2005).

The objective of the study on the use of code-switching among TESL students is to observe how often students code-switch between English and Malay, the students’ native language. The respondents majored in Teaching English as a Second Language, therefore, they were expected to communicate in English in class with their peers and lecturer. Results of the study would provide data to lecturers and curriculum planners on the extent of code-switching and the use of mother tongue in the class.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Types of Code-switching

This research focused on the three major types of code-switching identified by Poplack (1980, p. 613-615) as “tag-switching,” “inter-sentential switching,” and “intra-sentential switching.” Tag-switching is phrased by Romaine (1989, p. 112) as the insertion of words that can be put anywhere within the boundary of a sentence or speech without violating the grammatical rules of that sentence. Inter-sentential switching involves “a switch at a clause or sentence boundary” (Romaine, 1989, p. 112) where, for example, the clause or sentence might have been in L1 before changing to L2 (Yletyinen, 2004, p. 15). Intra-sentential switching occurs when words or phrases from another language are inserted into a sentence of the first language (Yletyinen, 2004, p. 15). When two different languages are utilised in a sentence, proficiency in both languages is a prerequisite in avoiding structural errors.

### 2.2. Reasons for Code-Switching

In her study, Malik (1994) developed 10 communicative functions of code-switching. In the present study these functions serve as a framework of motives for code-switching in a communicative event in the classroom:

#### 2.2.1. Lack of Facility

This term refers to bilingual or multilingual speakers who often code-switch when they are unable to find the appropriate terminology or identical word(s) from the L2 vocabulary to match the word(s) of their native language L1. For instance the English term “social drinker” does not have an equivalent term in the Malay language simply because drinking is prohibited in Islam (Muthusamy, 2009, p. 4).

#### 2.2.2. Lack of Register

Muthusamy (2009) states that when “a certain vocabulary is not available to a speaker in the first language,” he or she switches to the second language during a dialogue. Anderson (2006, p. 38) suggests that certain phrases would sound better in the L2 than in the L1 and this usually triggers code-switching. For example, “*La clase de hoy fue way over my head.*” (Today’s class was way over my head). The phrase “over my head” is an English phrase meaning “beyond my understanding.”

### 2.2.3. Mood of the Speaker

The mood of the speaker determines the kind of languages to be used. In a rationale and stable state of mind, a person is able to think of the right vocabulary to be used in the target language (Muthusamy, 2009). Code switching is triggered when the speaker is emotionally affected (e.g. upset, excited, tired, happy, surprised, scared or distracted) (Crystal, 1987 as cited by Skiba, 1997).

### 2.2.4. To Emphasize a Point

Anderson (2006) elaborates that when a speaker needs to stress a particular statement he or she will code-switch to the other language; “*Llamé pero no había nadie*. I missed him so bad!” (“I called but there was no one there. I missed him so bad!”) (p. 38). The switch from Spanish (L1) to English (L2) emphasizes the speaker’s affection towards a certain individual. Emphasis is also used when the same statement is repeated in two different languages. A study by Taha (2008) found that Arab teachers teaching English tend to make statements in English and repeat them in Arabic in order to emphasize the point of the statement or to make the students understand what the teachers are talking about (p. 341).

### 2.2.5. Habitual Experience

Popularly used discourse markers such as “you know,” “I mean” or “like” (Romaine, 1989, p. 112) that are placed before or in the middle of a sentence can sometimes be used in the other language. For example, “*Oyes* (listen) or “*pero*” (but) in Spanish (Malik, 1994). These fixed phrases usually occur spontaneously within a speech. David (2003) provides an example of a “habitually mixed discourse” in a Malaysian courtroom where Malay is used as the dominant language but a law term in English is inserted; “*Kes merupakan arrest case atau kes saman?*” (“Is this an arrest case or a summons case?”).

### 2.2.6. Semantic Significance

From Gal’s (1979) point of view, code-switching can sometimes be used to signal the speaker’s attitude, communicative intentions, and emotions to convey linguistic and social information. Choy (2011) explains it as a “verbal strategy” (p. 25). Crystal (1987) supports this by also saying that language alternation occurs when bilingual speakers want to convey their attitude or emotions to each other (as cited by Skiba, 1997).

### 2.2.7. To Show Identity with a Group

Crystal (1987) asserts that an individual switches to express solidarity with a particular social group. Rapport is only established when the group responds with a similar switch (as cited by Skiba, 1997). It is the same when an instructor code-switches in the classroom in order to build solidarity and associate in friendly relations with the students. Code-switching, then, establishes a supportive language environment in the classroom (Sert, 2005).

### 2.2.8. To Address a Different Audience

Code switching is applied as part of a welcoming address in admitting someone new to a communicative event. This could occur over different linguistics backgrounds (Malik, 1994) or from the same linguistic background (Holmes, 2001, p.35).

### 2.2.9. Pragmatic Reasons

Speakers may code switch in order to call attention to the context of a conversation (Malik, 1994). For instance, in a conversation about dieting, a speaker may use his L1 to stress his personal feelings about the issue and L2 to stress the referential context which is advice from his doctor (Holmes, 2001, p. 41).

### 2.2.10. To Attract Attention

Malik (1994) explains that in India, English newspapers contain non-English vocabulary such as Hindi or other Indian languages in order to attract readers' attention. The reader would have to use his or her language schemata to understand the message that the newspaper conveys. In Malaysia, "*bahasa rojak*" is popularly used among the locals. "*Bahasa rojak*" refers to "any mixture of two or more languages in a communicative event, with any one of the languages being the base language" (Husni Abu Bakar, 2009, p. 99).

## 3. Methodology

A survey was conducted to gather quantitative data while observations and interviews were conducted to triangulate the findings. The purposive sample of the population consisted of an intact class of 28 students enrolled in the B.Ed (TESL) programme at the Faculty of Education in a tertiary institution in Malaysia. The researchers were interested in finding out how code-switching is used as a communicative tool in classroom interaction. Therefore, a case study was deemed appropriate. The researchers selected one particular course which was noted for interactive activities to be observed intensively. The course, which was an English literature course, was specifically chosen because it required students to speak English during all lessons and the instructor had embedded a number of interactive activities that supported oral communication.

The instruments consisted of a set of questionnaire, observations, and interviews. The questionnaire consisted of a 14-item survey that was divided into five different sections that gathered data on demography, language use in the classroom, respondents' perception, frequency, and reasons for code switching. Sections A through D in the questionnaire contained questions that were developed by the researchers while section E (10 reasons for code-switching) was adapted and modified from Muthusamy (2009). Prior to the actual study, the content validity of the questionnaire was scrutinised by a panel of experts. The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot test. A reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha on SPSS 17.0 returned an alpha value of .85. Based on DeVellis's (1991) and George and Mallery's (2003) statements on interpreting reliability statistics, the instrument has very good internal consistency.

Copies of the questionnaire were only distributed after all five observations had been completed. This was to prevent the questionnaire from becoming an intervening variable (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2010, p. 174). Five observations were conducted throughout a three-month duration to observe the consistency in classroom interaction on the use of code-switching among TESL students. The researchers observed and listened to the interaction taking place in the classroom and manually took notes of conversations that contained the use of code-switching. The observations were based on an observational framework adapted and modified from a research done by Greggio and Gil (2007) which proved to be instrumental in conducting a systematic observation that covered the following aspects: (i) situation for code-switching, (ii) time of code-switching, (iii) lecturer's language use, (iv) students' language use, (v) reason for code-switching, and (vi) type of code-switching. After the dialogues were properly transcribed, they were summarized into five different frameworks, each one representing the five different observations conducted.

A total of 10 respondents were selected at random for the interview sessions. The interviews were conducted individually at the conclusion of the observation sessions. The eight questions created for the interviews were all structured and based on the five research questions that the study was aimed at investigating. With the permission of the interviewees', the interview sessions were recorded for analysis.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1. The Types of Code-switching Observed.

Based on all five observations, it was found that all three types of code-switching were used for classroom interaction. However, inter-sentential switching was the most frequent type of code-switching to be used with a total of 16 times in all five observations, followed closely by intra-sentential switching with a total of 12 times in all five observations. Tag switching was only noticed twice. The findings of this analysis is almost consistent with the study conducted by Yletyinen (2004) who found that intra-sentential code-switching was “the most employed type to be used in teaching grammar in the EFL classroom” (p. 103). This was followed by inter-sentential code-switching which was used almost as consistently for other functions in the classroom such as “providing explanations, requesting help, or informal interaction” (p. 103). However, as in the present study, tag-switching was the least used feature in the EFL classroom.

### 4.2. Reasons that Contribute to the Use of Code-switching

The result of the descriptive analysis on Section E of the questionnaire revealed students’ ranking of 10 reasons for code-switching. In Table 1, the reasons are ranked ascending from the highest mean score to the lowest mean score. It was found that the reason “To Emphasize a Point” had the highest mean ( $m=7.3571$ ) which means that a majority of the respondents code-switched to either stress a particular statement or to make a statement clearer for others to understand. However, the reason “To Attract Attention”, ( $m=1.7857$ ), had the lowest mean score which shows that not many students code-switched to attract the attention of others to their speech. This highlights a lack of assertiveness among the respondents.

Table 1. Students’ ranking of reasons for code-switching

Ranking	Reasons	N	Mean
1	To Emphasize a Point	28	7.3571
2	Semantic Significance	28	7.2143
3	Lack of Register	28	6.5714
4	Lack of Facility	28	6.1786
5	Habitual Experience	28	5.8571
6	To Address a Different Audience	28	5.7857
7	Mood of the Speaker	28	5.3571
8	Pragmatic Reasons	28	5.2143
9	To Show Identity with a Group	28	3.6786
10	To Attract Attention	28	1.7857
	Valid N (listwise)	28	

However, the findings of the questionnaire contradicted with the findings of the observations. It was found that the class mostly code-switched in order to “show identity with a group” (Observations 1, 2, 3 and 5) and occurred for a total number of six times throughout all five observations. This result includes interaction with the lecturer as well which means that because everyone in the classroom shared the same mother tongue and were Malay Muslims, the tendency to code-switch for the reason of solidarity was predictable. However, code-

switching for “pragmatic reasons” (Observation 2) and “addressing a different audience” (Observation 1) were observed to occur the rarest in the class, both of which shared an equivalent occurrence of one time. This was because there weren’t many conversations that involved expressing feelings about a personal issue (“pragmatic reasons”) among the students. Secondly, the close bond that the lecturer had with the students indicated that code-switching was bound to occur whether the students were speaking to the lecturer or amongst themselves. Often, the type of conversations or discussions held between the lecturer and the students were informal, hence there was no difference in terms of the way they addressed the lecturer and vice versa.

The findings of the interviews revealed that 50% of the interviewees often code-switched due to “lack of register”. Being native speakers of Malay (L1) made it hard to maintain the use of English at all times as well as finding appropriate terms and concepts. The other 50% quoted that their reasons for code-switching was based on their mood and “to emphasize a point” which is consistent with the findings of the questionnaire that revealed this reason to be the most important to a majority of the students in the class.

#### 4.3. *The Dominant Language in Code-switching*

Table 2 shows the dominant language used in the classroom. Out of all 28 students, 85.7% used English as the designated language in majority of their classes. 71.4% chose English as the second most frequent language to communicate with their friends. 100% agreed that the language the instructor used most of the time to teach in class was English. In addition to this, 100% of the students preferred to speak English in the class when it came to addressing their lecturer. 92.9% of the students primarily chose to speak Malay because Malay was their native language while 71.4% spoke in Malay only when they were communicating with their classmates. However, based on the comparison of percentages in Table 2, it can be determined that the most frequent or dominant language used among the respondents in most situations when lessons were in progress was English.

Table 2. Language dominance

	English	Malay	Sarawak dialect	Sabah dialect	Other	TOTAL
Q2. What is the language that you speak most frequently in?	7.1	*92.9	-	-	-	100
Q3. What is the designated language of instruction in the majority of your classes?	*85.7	10.7	3.6	-	-	100
Q4. What is the language you most frequently use to communicate with your classmates in this class?	28.6	*71.4	-	-	-	100
Q5. What is the second most frequent language that you use to communicate with your classmates in this class?	*71.4	28.6	-	-	-	100
Q6. What is the language that the instructor uses most of the time in this class?	*100.0	-	-	-	-	100
Q7. What is the language that you use most of the time when talking to your instructor in this class?	*100.0					100

The findings of the questionnaire are concurrent with the observations conducted by the researchers which revealed that the dominant language spoken by the students (and the lecturer) in the class was English. The students were compelled by the lecturer to speak in English at all times. The dialogues noted by the researchers during the observations indicated that although code-switching from English to Malay occurred frequently, the language of instruction remained to be English.

Finally, the findings of the interviews are concurrent with the findings of both the questionnaire and observations. The interviewees had mixed responses in stating the language of preference when speaking to their TESL counterparts. 50% stated that as TESL students, speaking English was a must. 30% revealed that they “preferred to code-switch” most of the time with their TESL peers. 10% opted to speak entirely in Malay while the remaining 10% stated that they spoke “mostly Malay and sometimes English,” especially when it came to discussing class assignments or anything related to their studies. However, all the participants spoke completely in English when communicating with their lecturers. They shared the same reason for speaking in the target language which was due to their obligation as TESL students. Other than asking the students about their language preference, the researchers also paid close attention to the language spoken by all 10 interviewees. It was observed that all the respondents successfully used English with minimal switching to utterances in Malay.

The findings from all three instruments are concurrent with Berlin’s (2005) statement, “the dominance of the target language is dependent on the language-learning environment” (p. 40). Berlin (2005) further adds that when speakers converse in the target language, they usually acquire a relatively higher status compared to when speaking the first language. Although learning the target language is preferable to the wider society, only the learner will decide whether he or she wants to acquire it based on how he or she feels about the usage of the target language (p. 40).

#### *4.4. Perceptions on the Use of Code-switching*

In the questionnaire, students’ perceptions on the use of code-switching were divided into three separate statements which required the students to “strongly agree,” “agree,” “disagree,” or “strongly disagree.” In reference to question 8, “I am aware that code-switching will affect my use of English,” a majority 60.7% chose to “agree” that they were aware of how code-switching would affect their use of English. This was followed by 25% of the class who “strongly agreed,” 10.7% who “disagreed,” and 3.6% who “strongly disagreed.” The open-ended responses to this question revealed that those who agreed or strongly agreed identified three negative effects of code-switching; failure to improve fluency and competency, lack of English vocabulary and frequent use of direct translation from Malay to English.

In reference to question 9 in the questionnaire, “I care that my language use will affect the development of my English language proficiency,” a majority 57.1% chose to “agree” which implied that they were concerned of the effects code-switching might have on their use of English. 39.3% was very concerned and chose to “strongly agree.” Only 3.6% “strongly disagreed” that code-switching affected the development of his English proficiency. The open-ended response to this question revealed that those who agreed or strongly agreed thought that they would be better speakers of English if they practiced using the target language more often and that the lack of English usage would affect their studies in terms of speaking and writing.

In reference to final question 10, “code-switching is effective in the classroom,” a majority 53.6% “agreed” and 7.1% “strongly agreed” that code-switching was effective, but 39.3% thought otherwise. Those who agreed thought that code-switching provided ease of communication in the classroom, helped to bridge the gap between students and the instructor, and helped them understand the concepts and terms in lessons better. However, those who disagreed claimed that since the language of instruction was English, code-switching only affected the students’ English proficiency and prevented them from using the language properly.

The findings of the questionnaire were then compared to the responses given by the interviewees and it was found that the interviewees’ responses to all three perception questions were consistent with the responses analyzed from the questionnaire. In responding to question 8: “I am aware that code-switching will affect my use

of English”, 70% of the participants shared the same opinion that code-switching would affect their English. Their reasons were because it would result in the decrease of vocabulary and incorrect use of sentence structure in the English language. They also believed that most students tended to transfer the sentence structure of the Malay language into their English sentences. However, 20% had mixed feelings about the effects of code-switching and gave two different opinions. The advantage of code-switching was that it helped improve their L2 proficiency. But the disadvantage was once a speaker started code-switching, the use of the L1 would overtake the use of L2. A small number (10%) disagreed and explained that code-switching would not affect their use of English because they practiced it every day. They insisted that although they code-switched from time to time, they usually found opportunities to speak entirely in English with their friends and family back home.

In response to question 9: “I care that my language use will affect the development of my English language proficiency,” all of the participants showed equal concern on how code-switching had influenced their use of English. A significant 60% expressed their concern toward the effects of code-switching by admitting that they felt “bored” when they had to code-switch with their friends. Before enrolling in the TESL programme, they presumed that English would be the only medium of communication. Instead, they found themselves “back to speaking Malay.” 20% of the respondents believed that they would be more fluent if they were to speak entirely in English than to code-switch. The remaining 20% were more neutral about the issue as code-switching was a normal occurrence since their first language was Malay. Therefore, they preferred to speak in Malay and only switched to English when required.

Question 10 (“code-switching is effective in the classroom”) elicited different responses from all the participants. 50% agreed that code-switching was effective in the classroom because it helps students understand lessons better and make “certain terms clearer” if they were explained in the native language. The remaining 30% said that while they supported the notion of code-switching in the language classroom, they believed that TESL lecturers at the faculty should be sterner in making sure that students use English all the time. Although the remaining 20% saw it as a “bad example” to students as it gave them an excuse to code-switch, they believed that it was still necessary. They stated that if the lecturer was “too persistent”, students would not have the confidence to speak up in class, especially if the proficiency level in the class is low.

The findings from both instruments of the survey and interviews parallels with the results of the study conducted by Yao (2011, p. 23-24) who found that the majority of the students strongly supported their teachers’ use of code-switching due to several reasons:

- Lessons were easier to understand,
- The teachers provided more words of encouragement and better feedback to the students,
- The learning atmosphere became more interactive, and
- Teachers who code-switched were better at negotiating and bonded more with the students compared to teachers who didn’t.

In addition to this, the researcher’s findings were also able to match the findings of the study done by Sell (2002) which revealed that the students in his class had no problem interacting in either language (L1 or L2) used to teach English.

#### *4.5. Frequency of Code-switching*

Similar to the previous research question, the frequency of code-switching was divided into three separate statements which required the students to select four different responses; “always,” “frequently,” “sometimes,” or “never”. In reference to question 11, “I code-switch in the classroom”, it was found that all of the students



practiced code-switching in their daily communication. However, when put in a classroom environment, 53.6% said they only code-switched “sometimes,” 25% admitted that they “frequently” code-switched and the remaining 21.4% confessed to “always” code-switching in class.

In reference to question 12, “I code-switch when I am speaking with my friends in class,” a majority 50% of the respondents declared that they would “frequently” code-switch. 28.6% admitted to “always” code-switch while the remaining 21.4% stated that they code-switched with their peers only “sometimes.”

In reference to question 13, “I code-switch when I am speaking to my instructor in class,” there were two groups, each with 35.7%, who were found to either code-switch “sometimes” or “never” in that context. This result is possibly due to the perception and norm in the faculty that English should always be spoken between TESL students and their lecturers. However, 17.9% admitted to code-switching with their instructor “frequently” and interestingly, 10.7% had “always” been code-switching when speaking to their instructor in class. After analysing the overall result, it was evident that the lecturer of the observed class did not mind code-switching with her students.

The researchers’ found that the frequency of code-switching during classroom observations had different time consistencies from Observation 1 until Observation 5. For example, the average time for code-switching to occur in Observation 1 was approximately 6 minutes apart. In Observation 2, it remained an average of 6 minutes. In Observation 3, code-switching occurred every 9 minutes. In Observation 4, code-switching occurred approximately every 10 minutes and Observation 5 showed an average of 14 minutes apart between the occurrences of one code-switching to another. The researchers found that the average time for code-switching to occur increased from Observation 1 to Observation 5. This indicated to the researchers that the more the students were being observed, the less frequent code-switching would occur.

The findings from the interviews are also consistent with the findings of both the questionnaire and observations. When asked how frequently they code-switched, 56% of the interviewees admitted to code-switching “sometimes,” 24% admitted to “frequently” code-switch, and the remaining 20% admitted to “always” code-switching in class. The main reason was to explain certain terms, concepts, or theories to other students. All the interviewees agreed that when it came to speaking to their lecturer, it was compulsory to use English.

By looking at all three findings, it can be stated that the average response to the use of code-switching varied between “sometimes,” “frequently,” and “always.” This is somewhat concurrent with the study conducted by Leong (2011) on Chinese TESL undergraduates at a Malaysian university who found that two of the most popular responses given on the frequency of English and Chinese code-switching were “sometimes” (highest) and “frequently” (second highest).

## 5. Implications of the Findings

Skiba (1997) suggested that instead of viewing code-switching as an interference in second or foreign languages, the big picture is for instructors to see code-switching as “a bridge between two languages that the students are learning” (Faltis, 1989, as cited by Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001) as it is an essential tool for language teaching and an “interactional strategy” (Van Dulm, 2007, p. 15) for social interactions. While the researchers agree to a great extent with this statement, it is not a suitable reference to all second language classrooms. The sample in this study was a classroom of TESL students who are bilingual with the ability to speak fluently in both Malay and English. The expectation for them to communicate proficiently in English is high because once they graduate, English would become the number one criteria in their future field of work. It is almost definite that the majority of these students will end up becoming language instructors. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that they hone their skills in the language and be trained to deliver English lessons with confidence. However, the findings revealed that these students code-switched in almost every sentence they spoke, including during formal class presentations when they were being assessed. The researchers also noticed numerous grammatical errors made during the interview sessions. These errors could fossilize if they are not rectified. However, the process of self-rectification would be hampered if these students continue to take short cuts by switching languages instead of practicing the correct usage of grammar and vocabulary.

Instructors who permit code-switching or code-switch themselves may be setting the wrong example to these students. This prompts the researchers to wonder whether code-switching is really an effective communicative tool to be used in the language classroom. This begs the question “whether allowing classroom language learners to freely switch between languages would be beneficial to the learning experience” (Tiemer, 2004, p. 69). Despite the linguistic potential and value of classroom code-switching, L2 learners require a requisite amount of input and practise in the target language if they are to develop their fluency and competency in the language to the level acceptable for an English language instructor. Practicing code-switching is effective for student learning and it is encouraged to be used when teaching students of low proficiency. But it must not be allowed to overtake the target language in the classroom. Therefore, it is hoped that the overall result of this study will provide a basis for lecturers to control and strategize the use of code-switching in their English-oriented classes.

## References

- Husni Abu Bakar. (2009). *Code-switching in Kuala Lumpur Malay- The “Rojak” Phenomenon*, *Explorations*, 9, 99-107. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/10712>
- Anderson, T. K. (2006). *Spanish-english bilinguals' attitudes toward code-switching: Proficiency, grammaticality and familiarity*. The Pennsylvania State University. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305259787?accountid=42518>
- Berlin, L. N. (2005). *Contextualizing college ESL classroom praxis: a participatory approach to effective instruction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Brice, A. & Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2001). Choice of Languages in Instruction: One Language or Two? *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33 (4), 10-16.
- Choy, W. F. (2011). *Functions and Reasons for Code-switching on Facebook by UTAR English-Mandarin Chinese Bilingual Undergraduates*. Unpublished dissertation. Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/263/1/EL-2011-0803813-1.pdf>
- David, M. K. (2003). The Pakistani Community in Machang, Kelantan Language Shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 161, 47-53.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale Development: theory and applications* (Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 26). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2010). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greggio, S. & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and Learner's Use of Code Switching in the EFL classroom: a Qualitative Study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10 (2), 371-393.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two language. An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Malik, L. (1994). *Sociolinguistics: A Study of Code-switching*. New Delhi: Anmol.
- Leong, K. Y. Code-switching: bilingual incompetence or effective communicative strategy? Unpublished dissertation. Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, 2011. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/261/1/EL-2011-0806580-1.pdf>
- Muthusamy, P. (2009). *Communicative functions and reasons for code switching : A Malaysian perspective*. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from [www.crisaps.org/newsletter/summer2009/Muthusamy.doc](http://www.crisaps.org/newsletter/summer2009/Muthusamy.doc)
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-616.
- Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sell, J. (2002). The Effects of Code-Switching in Interactional Language on Task Performance in the English Class. *Encuentro Journal*, 13-14, pp. 185-198. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from [www.encuentrojournl.org/textos/13.18.pdf](http://www.encuentrojournl.org/textos/13.18.pdf)
- Sert (2005). The Functions in Code-switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11 (8). Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code Switching as a Countenance of Language Interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3 (10). Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>
- Taha, T. A. (2008). Language Alternation in University Classrooms. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(4), 336-346. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Tiemer, W. Code-switching repertoires in the language classroom: Contextualization and the enactment of shared perceptions in the talk of language learners. Retrieved from *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*; 2004; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT).
- Van Dulm, O. (2007). *The grammar of English-Afrikaans code switching: A feature checking account*. Published dissertation. Netherland: LOT. Retrieved on 5 August, 2011 from [www.lotpublications.nl/publish/articles/002423/bookpart.pdf](http://www.lotpublications.nl/publish/articles/002423/bookpart.pdf)
- Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language*, 1(1): 19-28.
- Yletyinen, H. *The Functions of Codeswitching in EFL Classroom Discourse*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Jyväskylä, 2004.